

City of Springfield  
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL WORK SESSION MEETING OF  
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD  
MONDAY, AUGUST 16, 2004.

The City of Springfield council met in a work session in the Library Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, August 16, 2004 at 5:03 p.m., with Council President Fitch and Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Councilors Ballew, Woodrow, Lundberg, Ralston and Fitch. Mayor Leiken arrived at 6:10 p.m. Also present were City Manager Mike Kelly, Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

1. Proposed Glenwood Urban Renewal District and Resolution for a Ballot Measure Allowing City Council Approval of Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan.

Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas introduced this item. At the July 26, 2004 Work Session, council considered potential Urban Renewal Districts in Downtown and Glenwood and directed staff to prepare proposals for both areas. Council indicated a preference for proceeding with a 20-year Glenwood Urban Renewal District in conjunction with Lane County if Lane County had a positive interest. Lane County Commissioners Dwyer and Hampton indicated positive support for Springfield setting up a Glenwood Urban Renewal District. They see a benefit to the county and are interested in participating in the preparation of the project list and made several suggestions for ideas to add to that list. The Lane County Board will be discussing this issue at a future board meeting, yet to be scheduled. Council needs to place a measure on the November 2, 2004 ballot to meet City Charter provisions. Voter approval would allow council to approve the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan.

Development Services Director Bill Grile presented the staff report on this item. Two Lane County Board Commissioners indicated positive support for Springfield setting up a Glenwood Urban Renewal District covering all of Glenwood. With Lane County's approval the council can adopt an urban renewal district that includes areas in Glenwood not yet annexed to the city. Key to Lane County's approving the Plan is involvement with the city in constructing the list of projects. Attachment 1 included in the agenda packet describes the process to establish the Glenwood Urban Renewal District.

As a preliminary draft Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan, Attachment 2 included in the agenda packet provides general outlines of the text portion of the plan, a list of projects, and their estimated costs in 2004 dollars. Numerous projects could be done in Glenwood depending on the estimated revenue and the district's planned duration of twenty years. Desired projects, their costs, potential revenue, policies, duration of the Urban Renewal District, etc. are typically set by the Urban Renewal Agency. Council established Springfield's Urban Renewal Agency in 1986: the Springfield Economic Development Agency (SEDA). SEDA's powers and authority are exercised by the governing body of the City of Springfield acting as the Urban Renewal Agency. The Mayor

and council would convene SEDA as the Urban Renewal Agency in September to begin that process.

Approval of the proposed resolution (Attachment 3) places a measure on the November 2, 2004 ballot. With voters approving the question, council could adopt the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan as required by provisions of the City Charter (Attachment 4 in the agenda packet) and State Law.

Mr. Grile asked council for their ideas or suggestions regarding this plan. He commended Community Services Director John Tamulonis for his work on this item. Mr. Tamulonis has done most of the information gathering. Mr. Grile noted that the draft plan included in the packet is very draft with some unanswered questions. He said he looks forward to critical input from council, staff, property owners and citizens of Glenwood.

Mr. Grile discussed property included in an Urban Renewal District (URD) once it is annexed into the city. The city's tax rate applies against all the assessed value that existed prior to the establishment of the URD when property is annexed into the city.

Councilor Fitch asked for an example of land in the URD that could be annexed into the city and how those figures would relate to the city's taxes and the URD portion.

Mr. Grile discussed the compression factor for Glenwood and that staff would look into that. When creating an URD, there must be a plan and a report. The report would address the fiscal consequences. He also discussed maximum allowable debt, which is a cap that an agency cannot exceed. An URD must have debt as part of the district per statutory requirement. If the district has resources and is not in debt, the resources must be distributed to the taxing bodies and the URD ends at that point. There are ways to accumulate cash and incur debt at the same time. The council, acting as the Urban Renewal Agency, is in complete control of any debt that is incurred. The URD Board would not incur debt without the resources, through tax increment resources, to retire the debt. There are several ways to incur debt: 1) Promissory note to the city - a contract with the city to do certain projects and accumulate cash. The city wouldn't call that cash in, allowing the URD to accumulate cash resources; and 2) Small amount of tax increment money coming in, not enough to do a bond issue, and negotiate a conventional loan to jump start a program. There is no risk to the city as a result of incurring debt through urban renewal. He discussed the project list in the Urban Renewal Plan. Each of the projects does not need to be completed, but the list allows the district to do the projects that need to be done as they are needed. They carry out the objective of the plan.

Mr. Grile said Urban Renewal Districts are not land developers. It is the role of the URD to provide infrastructure and to create a climate where positive development and redevelopment can happen. The costs of each project are hypothetical and can be revised up or down according to the scope of the project. There may be sufficient tax increment revenue to do all of the projects. It is the estimation of the consultant, Charles Kupper, that given the status quo inflation in the Glenwood area, there could be \$23M - \$25M of tax increment revenue over a twenty year period. He referred to the report from Mr. Kupper showing tax increment revenue with or without annexation. The assumptions would be shown through his report.

Councilor Ballew asked if those assumptions were based on an URD not being in place.

Mr. Grile said that would be his understanding.

Mr. Grile discussed the ballot title for an Urban Renewal District in Glenwood and the purposes for the district. The purpose, as listed in the document, is to eliminate blight and the causes of blight by providing infrastructure and an incentive for the private sector to make investments that heretofore have largely not happened. He referred to the Request for Information (RFI) that was sent out earlier this year by Planner Susanna Julber. There were no responses from the RFI. When meeting with developers to ask why they did not submit an RFP, they told staff that the city didn't have enough in the way of incentives and the timing was not right for them. He referred to an air photo outlining the proposed URD. Approximately forty percent of the proposed URD is incorporated into the City of Springfield and the remaining sixty percent is not yet annexed. He referred to attachment 2 in the agenda packet. He discussed property acquisition and the limits involved, which he considers as safeguards. There are no private properties planned for acquisition in the URD Plan as drafted in its current form. The Plan also provides direction regarding property disposition and redevelopment, which are safeguards drafted in the document that would prevent the agency from being abusive regarding land banking property. Plan amendments are important administrative provisions with URDs. He noted a revision that needs to be made to Section 900a on page 2-14 in the agenda packet, which refers to major amendments. The urban renewal consultant has advised staff to call those substantial amendments to mirror the language in ORS457. Those substantial amendments are a change in direction or a radical expansion of the scope of something and require the same process as establishing the URD initially. There are other amendments that require council approval, and minor amendments that can be done by resolution of the URD Board.

Mr. Grile discussed the provision of expanding the district by not more than one percent. He will be doing some further checking into that limit. He discussed maximum indebtedness and the calculation used for this figure. Those figures relate to the number of years the district is in place. There are ways to make those adjustments. He discussed the Plan Completion, Review, Approval and Adoption Procedure outlined in the agenda packet which was also displayed on the chart on the wall. It outlined the timeline from today until January 2005. Unless the county chose to be a governance partner in this, they would not be required to adopt the plan. The Urban Renewal Agency would consist of the Springfield Mayor and Council. If the council adopts the proposed Urban Renewal Plan after hearing public input and partner cooperation before the end of the calendar year, it would be forwarded to the assessor's office who would freeze the value of the properties starting July 1, 2005.

Ms. Pappas referred to the draft plan and noted the items the County Commissioners were most interested in and asked to have included.

Mr. Grile said that one of the projects removed from the list was regarding administrative costs. The URD would create some administrative costs. In his opinion, the Urban Renewal Agency should have its own legal counsel, auditor and insurance carrier. It will also cost staff time through the City Manager's Office, Development Services, Public Works and Finance; however,

the agency would be implementing things the city would be wanting to do anyway. The URD Board could put restraints on the amount of administrative transfer allowed.

Councilor Ralston asked if the URD would still be in debt after the 20 years.

Mr. Grile said it is up to the council as the URD Board to determine how much debt they incur. The agency can legally be in debt beyond the duration of the URD, but would stop incurring debt as long as they hadn't gone above the maximum allowable cap.

Ms. Pappas explained how the Economic Development Committee was formed. They could expand membership on that board or just keep it to the Mayor and council.

Mr. Ralston asked about the Sheriff's substation and court facility referred to in the project list and why a new facility was needed.

Ms. Pappas said they are currently leasing those facilities at this time from a private property owner. They may want to construct their own facility in the future.

Councilor Ralston said forty percent of properties are already annexed. He asked about the value of the existing businesses which have already been annexed and how that related to tax increases.

Mr. Grile said there is a three percent cap for the city, although new development and remodeling can go above the three percent.

Councilor Ralston said we would not realize the benefit of additional taxes until the URD is expired.

Mr. Grile said the city is currently receiving no taxes from the sixty percent of the properties not currently annexed into the city. If urban renewal stimulated redevelopment and annexation of those properties, the city could apply the tax rate set on those properties prior to the URD being formed.

Councilor Ralston said if Glenwood were to redevelop and annex into the city, it would eventually need a fire station and police services. He asked if the URD would pay for all of those services.

Mr. Grile said there would be a large amount of commercial and industrial development that would not require the extensive demand on services such as residential development requires.

Councilor Ralston said it is conceivable that a fire station would need to be built near that area in the future and would need to be paid for somehow. He wants to be clear on who would have to pay for those services and if it would be passed on to the rest of the citizens.

Mr. Grile said typically urban renewal softens the blow of those types of things for citizens by providing another way to have the area where the facility needs to be built paid for with urban renewal dollars. Operations of those facilities would be a separate issue. Urban Renewal Agencies cannot hire personnel to provide general services.

Councilor Ralston said the URD would be well suited for infrastructure, but the operations' expenses would be something the city would have to incur.

Mr. Grile said the city may have to incur those costs whether an URD is formed or not as Glenwood properties annex into the city.

Councilor Ballew said she was not pleased that council leadership dropped the downtown area from consideration for an URD. She has a problem with doing individual, residential property renovation and redevelopment. She referred to Attachment 2, page 14 which discussed when special notice is and is not required as provided in ORS457.120. She asked what kind of special notice that would include, such as letters to individual property owners.

Mr. Grile said there are two types of amendments. The major amendments require the same process council is going through to form the URD. Minor amendments can be done by resolution of the agency. Major amendments require council action, notice and may be appealed. Minor amendments by resolution cannot be appealed.

Councilor Ballew referred to Attachment 2, page 16 which referred to providing housing within financial reach for residents who may be displaced.

Mr. Grile said issues about health hazards in Glenwood would most likely come before the agency at some point. Currently, there are sanitation problems in Glenwood. He discussed the issues of septic systems that are failing in Glenwood. At some point, because there is sewer available down Franklin Boulevard, an enforcement agency could decide to take action to deal with failing systems. One of the things at the agency's discretion would be to use tax increment dollars to run public laterals down the side streets south of Franklin Boulevard and to offer Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to assist low to moderate income homeowners to hook up to the sewer. That is the type of housing assistance that urban renewal would be best suited for.

Councilor Ballew said her understanding of a lateral is what runs from the house to the system. She said tax increment financing would be used to give things to people that normal citizens are not given, whether there is a health issue or not. It is a sensitive area and the use of CDBG funds is a reasonable alternative, rather than using tax increment financing for personal assistance.

Mr. Grile said that is the type of policy decisions the council, as the Urban Renewal Agency, could make.

Councilor Ballew said the plan is almost a wish list of what we would love to have, but not all of it has much to do with urban renewal. She gave some examples.

Mr. Grile said there are a number of things on the list that would rid Glenwood of the blight situation. This is just a suggested list and staff would appreciate feedback from the council on what they believe would help stimulate development in Glenwood.

Ms. Pappas said the action they are being asked to take tonight has nothing to do with the plan.

Councilor Lundberg said she feels it is difficult to understand it all, especially since the area includes all of Glenwood. She knows they spoke with County Commissioner leadership, but asked if they were talking on behalf of the entire Board of Commissioners. She asked for clarification about how this area, which includes so much in the county, will be accomplished.

Ms. Pappas said they spoke with County Commissioners Bill Dwyer and Don Hampton, not commissioner leadership. Those two commissioners did not speak for the entire board, but they did seem to think the board would be supportive. The board has not taken any action on this issue as a whole. They will be discussing this in the coming weeks.

Councilor Lundberg said that if the full Board of Commissioners were not supportive of this idea, where would that leave the city.

Mr. Grile said they could look into shared governance with the county for the Urban Renewal District. There are examples of URD in unincorporated areas where the county takes the lead and invites representatives from the city to sit on the Board. Another option would be to abandon pursuit of the district. The county is required to approve the Urban Renewal Plan because it includes areas in an unincorporated area. Governance would either be shared between the city and the county or the county could have its own URD.

Mr. Kelly said the concern from the two County Commissioners was the financial impact to Lane County. The county has a planned financial future with some serious financial conditions for Lane County in the next couple of years. An URD within the county will have an impact on compression. All local governments are getting close to the cap. Parts of Eugene are already in compression, but Springfield is not yet in compression. The two Lane County Commissioners said as districts are formed, it would freeze the tax the county is counting on for funding. They prefer we only form one district rather than two. If there was something within the Glenwood URD that would benefit Lane County as a government by offsetting some of their costs, they could be supportive. The meeting with the commissioners was not detailed, but was more conceptual. When a URD is limited and there is some benefit to the county, they can be supportive. Council can make some adjustments to the boundaries and another council meeting could be held on Monday, August 23 with a new boundary and ballot title.

Councilor Lundberg said it is somewhat contingent on what the county chooses regarding approval.

Mr. Grile said it is very contingent on the county.

Mr. Kelly discussed our charter and the requirement to go to the voters to create an URD.

Mr. Grile said as a newcomer to the area, what has impressed him in Springfield are the strengths of the partnerships that have been developed and the way these partners try to advance mutual goals. There is potentially an opportunity to build on the partnership with the county.

Councilor Lundberg said part of what we were trying to accomplish with an URD is to encourage developers we would most prefer. How is this going to create an atmosphere for developers we want rather than those we don't want? She asked if there was a master plan.

Mr. Grile said council's discretionary judgment as well as the plan amendments to the Glenwood Refinement Plan would provide more direction as to the kinds of uses and the ways they are developed along Franklin Boulevard. If a developer came in across the river and needed infrastructure and roads in order to start developing, urban renewal could be the tool to assist. He discussed system development charges (SDC's) which go into a special fund for construction of infrastructure and other related items. Those could also be used for the development in the URD.

Ms. Pappas said this provides a financing tool for the developers. The master plan must still be in place to get the type of development council wants. Both are needed.

Councilor Lundberg said she would like the ballot title to include the time frame of the URD. Voters would feel more comfortable if they knew the time frame.

Ms. Pappas said the caption, question and summary are limited to a certain number of words. Both the caption and question are at their maximum allowable words, but perhaps additional language describing the length of time the URD would be in place could be added into the summary.

Councilor Lundberg said it is one of the issues that needs to be addressed.

City Attorney Joe Leahy said it would be difficult to get this additional language into the question portion of the ballot title. The requirement of the charter has caused them to rework the question many times. They could include the length of time in the statement.

Councilor Lundberg said it would be acceptable to place it in the statement.

Councilor Fitch asked what would need to be done if they chose to add that wording into the ballot title tonight.

Mr. Leahy said he would work with staff to try to fit it into the ballot title tonight prior to council voting on it during their Regular Meeting. Whatever they adopt as council this evening, will be what is put on the ballot in November.

Councilor Ballew asked if the county charged SDC's.

Jeff Towery, from the Land Management Division of Lane County, said the county charges Parks SDC's on residential development only.

Councilor Ballew said if development occurs in the unincorporated area, SDC's would not be charged and the city would not receive that revenue. She asked where the SDC's would go for development that occurs in the incorporated area.

Ms. Pappas said the SDC's would go to the entity which charges them. The SDC's go into the special SDC fund in the city, not to the URD or the General Fund. Once property is annexed into the city, SDC's would be charged for the development. It would be business as usual as SDC's are a charge, not a tax.

Councilor Fitch said because this is in the urban growth boundary, most developers would want to hook up to a sewer and to do that they would need to annex to the city. SDC's would then be charged to the annexed property when it was developed.

Councilor Ballew asked if a developer would have to pay fees through both the city and the Urban Renewal Agency. She asked if they would have to talk with two agencies.

Mr. Grile said the developer would talk with the same people as they do now, but those people would be able to speak on behalf of both entities. Staff could inform developers of city incentives within the city and other incentives within the URD.

Councilor Woodrow asked about the debt limit. His understanding is that it is deficit spending with a preset limit and end site.

Mr. Grile said it is not deficit spending. He described the maximum allowable debt limit, which is a cap. If the URD could repay \$40M worth of improvements because of the assessed value growth in that area, Glenwood could be the pearl it deserves to be. It would be paid for by its own revenue.

Councilor Woodrow asked if as the URD progresses and people start to annex to the city, they will be paying taxes and SDC's to the city. If so, it is not subsidizing any of that growth. He referred to Attachment 1, page 1. He asked if the 4J School District was included in the affected taxing bodies the Urban Renewal Board would meet with in the fall.

Mr. Grile said they are included. There was an error in the attachment. It should not have listed School District 19, but rather 4J School District.

Councilor Woodrow asked if that would give Eugene or the 4J School District the right to be involved in anything that goes on in the district.

Mr. Grile said the Urban Renewal Agency would have to consult with them, but would only have to get approval from the county.

Councilor Woodrow said without the URD, there would probably be growth, but maybe not the type of growth that would be beneficial to Springfield or Glenwood.

Mr. Grile described the growth in that area and regulations. The URD would be a financial tool and incentive for developers.

Ms. Pappas said it is more about the timing of the development rather than the type of development.



Councilor Fitch referred to Attachment 2, page 20. Item 49 on the project lists states "Provide other city/county public service facilities". Potentially, if the growth occurs as is anticipated which requires the need to move a fire station to that area, item 49 could be a new fire station if that was what the governing body approved. This list is similar to the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) list. The agency would set priorities and could potentially save the city money.

Councilor Fitch said discussion on this item had gone over 10 minutes, but she wanted to make sure council had all of their questions answered. At the July 26, 2004 Work Session, council had indicated they only wanted one and not two districts; therefore, the downtown district was removed.

Councilor Ballew referred to the URD paying for a fire station and said nothing is free. The city would not receive the tax increment it could have realized during the life of the URD.

Mr. Kelly said sometimes with tax increment, a community may be able to attract larger and better developers because there is a plan, techniques and strategy in place. The increased tax would not go to the city during the duration of the district, but the city may end up with a lot more money in the end of the twenty years than it may have without urban renewal.

Councilor Ballew referred to Attachment 2, page 20, item 47 "Build Lane County Sheriff substation facility". For this type of project, who issues the debt, who owns the facility, who guarantees the debt, and who takes property ownership? She could understand if the agency issued debt and the county paid rent on it to retire the debt, but not in any other way.

Mr. Grile said that is how the Portland Development Commission has been so successful in redeveloping property and then leasing it out. There are a number of ways it can be structured. He said staff would welcome more discussions with council on this one on one or however they would choose to discuss it further.

## 2. Public Safety Facility Bond Measure.

Police Chief Jerry Smith presented the staff report on this item. Council has discussed constructing a new public safety facility and a municipal jail.

The facility housing the police, court and city prosecutor was originally constructed in 1949 and 1957 and has undergone several remodels. The facility was not constructed to house a police department and in fact consists of two separate contiguous buildings. The current facility contains a 10 bed jail.

The current facility consists of approximately 24,000 square feet and because of design, presents cost prohibitive or structural prohibitions to expansion. A companion discussion to the issue of constructing a new public safety facility is a decision on whether to construct a municipal jail. The current police facility houses a ten bed jail that is used as a holding facility after years of use as a municipal jail.

Berry Architects performed a Space Needs Study in 1999 that has been used for cost projections as we move forward in discussions. Heery International, Inc. updated these cost figures resulting in a construction cost of \$24,065,136 for a facility to house police, municipal court, prosecutor and a municipal jail. These construction costs are based on two separately constructed buildings. Additional costs for land acquisition, fees, site preparation, demolition and financing costs bring the total cost to \$28,650,000. This would equate to an assessment of \$.87 per thousand. A facility that did not include a municipal jail would cost \$18,830,000 and require an assessment of \$.57 per thousand.

If a decision were made to construct a municipal jail as part of the public safety facility, some construction cost savings could be realized.

A concept drawing depicting the proposed Public Safety Facility and Jail was distributed to the Mayor and council.

Chief Smith recognized Carole Knapel from the city staff who has done a tremendous amount of work to gather the information presented to council. He also acknowledged Anne Fifield from ECONorthwest, Mike Harman, Senior Management Analyst from the Police Department, and Sue Cunningham and Scott Peralta from Heery International. Heery International helped develop the cost estimates and the massing study included in the agenda packet.

Chief Smith said the need to replace the public facility has been overshadowed by the issue of the jail. He read a letter from a person who had an acquaintance whose parole had been transferred from California to Oregon and the crimes this person continued to commit while out on parole. This is not something the city would handle in our municipal jail, but shows the seriousness of the problem of capacity of the Lane County jail. He discussed others that have been released early due to the matrixing system. That is why we are discussing a jail.

Chief Smith discussed some of the information from ECONorthwest that related to the number of jail beds. He referred to the report included in the agenda packet about repeat offenders and how incarceration could stop part of that cycle. There is a serious capacity issue in all of Lane County. In 2002, Springfield had the highest property crime rate in Oregon of comparable cities. Property crimes drive the crime rate. Insurance rates in a metro area are related to the crime rate of that area, so it affects everyone. He discussed the estimates of operating a jail, but noted that there are a number of delinquent fines that could be recovered and also fines that could be recovered from failure to appear. That could amount to nearly \$900,000. There is generally \$62,000 per year in unpaid traffic fines. People are not put into jail for traffic fines, but the court can issue a show cause requiring them to come back which compels them to pay. If the jail has the desired affect the amount that could be generated by these fines would decrease because the crime rate would decline and the case load of the court would decline. He discussed the reductions in cost if the city were to have its own jail facility. The city would still be required to take some criminals to the Lane County jail because a certain percentage of the cases go through Circuit Court.

Chief Smith discussed the option of contracting more beds with the Lane County Jail. He referenced a report provided by the Lane County Sheriff included in the agenda packet which identified the \$2.1M charge for 119 beds. Another option would be the \$1.4M for 84 beds and

\$900,000 for 35 beds. Those options are only good for two years and the city would be obligated to maintain the current five bed contract, which is \$165,000 this year. The report also discussed indirect costs.

Chief Smith said that Heery International provided a massing study which was included in the agenda packet. This study showed the new Police, Court and Jail facility could be located on the property already owned by the city, plus vacating B Street and part of 4<sup>th</sup> Street. It would be necessary to acquire nearby parking lots for public parking. The study confirmed the construction costs of \$24,100,000, which is consistent with the massing diagrams.

Chief Smith said the report submitted by the sheriff's office had some assumptions that may not be accurate. He noted the differences noted in that report. If the city chose to provide municipal jail beds, it would still be obliged to maintain the five bed contract for \$165,000. The contract from Lane County is only available for two years. He concluded by noting the current Police/Court building needs to be replaced. The lack of capacity at Lane County jail has crippled the criminal justice system. Decisions are being made by police, prosecutors and judges which are based on lack of jail space for criminals. Ideally, Lane County could step up and fix the problem, but this has gone on for fifteen years and still has not been resolved. He thanked council for listening to his report and said he would be happy to answer any questions.

Mayor Leiken said he was pleased the Chief emphasized the importance of replacing the current police facility.

Mr. Kelly said there are two issues before council. The first is the capital side, which is the bricks and mortar to build the facility. The companion issue is the staffing issue. Staff is not suggesting a staffing option be brought forward in November. Staff is suggesting that tonight under official action council speak to the issue of staffing if they choose to go forward with the bricks and mortar part of the project. There are three ways to staff the jail. One way would be in November 2006, joining with Lane County for a common solution to increase capacity. The second way to staff the jail would be to include staffing for the jail in the police levy which would be ready for renewal in November 2006. The third option would be the formation of a Fire District which could free up some General Fund tax dollars that could be used for staffing a jail. There is an item scheduled for the Regular Meeting which addresses initiating a change in the Metro Plan to allow the city to move forward toward a Fire District.

Discussion was held regarding the county's position on a Fire District.

Councilor Ralston referred to Chief Smith's comment that the city would still be required to use some of the Lane County jail space. He asked why the city couldn't transport the criminals to the municipal jail while they were waiting for their court appearance.

Chief Smith said the size of jail being considered wouldn't accommodate that situation.

Councilor Ralston asked how long from the time of a crime until a person was summoned to court to pay a fine. He asked if these people could be held in jail until their court date unless they choose to pay their fine up front.

Chief Smith said people have to be arraigned within a reasonable amount of time. They are generally scheduled to attend court at the next court date following their arraignment, which is contingent on weekends. At the arraignment, the court could reduce the bail amount, release the person on their own recognizance or send them back to jail. Because the city has not been in the bail business for so many years, there is no data to show how long it would take someone to come to a point where they would choose to pay bail. There are cases where people do post bail immediately, but in most cases, that is not true.

Councilor Ralston asked what part of this new process would ensure the city would collect more fines.

Chief Smith said it would be a decision by the courts whether or not to detain the person until they pay the fine or bail.

Judge Strickland from the Springfield Municipal Court said there are two scenarios. A bail schedule is set up, with follow-up letters reminding them to pay. Following the reminder letter, an order is sent out to show cause. If they do not show up for that, there is a warrant out and the jail facility could be used for leverage. The person could then be arrested and put in the jail. On the other side, after conviction, there is normally a payment schedule. If the person fails on the payment schedule, another order to show cause is sent out. The person could be incarcerated until they pay following that order. The same could be used for those who fail to do their community service or their drug and alcohol treatment.

Councilor Ralston said we need to convict them.

Judge Strickland said the court cannot convict them until they can be brought into court.

Councilor Ralston asked how long someone would have to stay in jail before they would be brought to court.

Judge Strickland said once they are in jail, he must try them within sixty days.

Chief Smith said that so many of the offenders the city deals with have drug and alcohol problems. These people cannot get their drugs or alcohol while they are in jail, so they have an incentive to get out.

Councilor Ralston asked about the operating expenses and if it included cable television. He feels the prisoners should have as few amenities as possible to make it an unpleasant experience.

Chief Smith said his vision of jail does not include television. The consultant who managed the jail in Marion County for a number of years said the television is a babysitter. That service would not be paid for by the General Fund or revenues. If council agreed to go forward and build this facility, televisions may be a part of the jail. It is not only something to keep the prisoners occupied for a time, but it is also a privilege that could be taken away. With the proposed staffing, there will not be a lot of time when the prisoners are out of their cells.

Councilor Ballew discussed the amendment to the Metro Plan which would allow a Fire District to go forward which will be discussed during the Regular Meeting. She said she is willing to put a Fire District on the ballot to see what the public says since they are paying for the bill. She wants to know what the public thinks before spending any more money on this issue. She would like to see some type of language that included receiving some type of vote from the people regarding formation of a Fire District. If people are not supportive, more time would be wasted. She recommended putting the Public Safety Facility on the ballot for a replacement facility for police, possibly fire and court as one issue and the jail as a separate vote. Language needs to be included that demonstrates that operating costs would be brought back in three or four years. The operating costs need to be included. It's important to know if people support that or not.

Councilor Woodrow said we need a new police facility and new courtrooms, and logic would dictate that it would be the right time to build the jail when the facility was being built. We need to let the people know that there will be a need to ask for funds to staff the jail in the future. It is important for council to educate the citizens how badly this is needed. Lane County is not likely to fix this problem in the next ten years. The citizens of Springfield will have a better quality of life. It is important to go forward and let the citizens vote. It is the council's obligation to educate the citizens of the importance of this facility.

Mr. Kelly said staff has suggested a motion by council during the Regular Meeting that is in the citizens' benefit to look for a common solution. The motion, created with the assistance of the Bond Council, states that the city will not sell bonds to build the jail portion of the Public Safety Building until the council is satisfied it has sufficient resources to staff that facility. That puts a contingency on our building to sell the bonds. The city can design the entire facility and start construction on everything except the jail until there is satisfaction that there are sufficient resources to operate the jail. This would allow the city to continue discussions with Lane County. It also gives the city until November 2006 to come up with our own staffing plan.

Councilor Lundberg said it is important to make this understandable to the public. She asked about those who would remain Lane County's responsibility such as felony offenders, female offenders and offenders with medical issues. The city is making decisions on which offenders we deal with if we have a facility. She asked for clarification on the percentage of people the city would still have to send back to Lane County. There is still a revolving door between the city and county. She asked about the medical services the municipal jail would provide.

Chief Smith said the city is obligated to offer some level of medical services. If an inmate will be eating the food, they must be examined by a nurse to make sure they are healthy enough to handle food products. One figure is a place holder for nursing staff to deal with some of those issues. The city must also have the ability to bring in a nurse if someone complains of a medical issue to determine if they do need medical care. If they do need medical care, they would be released from the jail to a hospital or appropriate facility. Sometimes accidents occur and people are hurt and need some medical attention.

Councilors Fitch and Lundberg asked about the percentage of inmates who are female.

Senior Management Analyst Mike Harman said the percentage of females is less than fifty percent.

Councilor Lundberg said we would not guarantee any beds and there would be the potential that the percentage of women prisoners would be at the discretion of the county. The city would then deal only with the other percentage.

Mr. Kelly said there are criminals that commit both felonies and misdemeanors. By the city taking care of some of the misdemeanor crimes by incarcerating these offenders, those offenders will not be out on the street with the opportunity to commit a felony. As the city incarcerates these offenders, it will free up beds at the Lane County Jail, which should improve that situation. He discussed the women prisoners that could be matrixed out of the county jail, but with additional beds freed up at the Lane County Jail, they may not be matrixed out as quickly.

Councilor Lundberg said the conversation has been focused on the jail. The administration of the police and the courts is important, but it is important to translate that into the safety of citizens. The jail is the pivotal piece to the safety element. Putting out a measure that does not include the jail component may not be as effective to the voters. She would be supportive of putting it to the voters. She would like the word 'bed' out of the ballot title if possible. It needs to be clear to the voters that the operations would have to be paid for separately.

Councilor Fitch said there are two motions. The first is for the facility and the second one states that the city will not issue bonds for the jail until the council is satisfied the operational costs can be covered. The community has said that public safety is an important issue, and they want the reality of holding criminals accountable. It's important to make sure the citizens are safe. She discussed the issue of our police officers and their frustration of not being able to do the job they need to do to get the criminal off the street. Incarceration also helps other alternative programs which use incarceration as possible sanctions. The public should have the right to vote. She is supportive of the facility and also of the piece regarding the cost of operations.

Mayor Leiken said he would like to give an additional ten minutes for this item. Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas notified the people in the Council Chambers that the Regular Meeting would be starting about ten minutes late.

Councilor Ralston said he is not interested in making the county feel better because they have not resolved the issue. He does not feel we need to have further discussions with Lane County.

Councilor Ballew said it has to do with money. The only way the city could operate the jail without additional resources is to offload the fire department or close the library. This needs to be clear to the voters. Need to get their vote up front whether or not they want to have the Fire Department. She feels the citizens will not like the statement about not constructing the jail until operating costs are secured.

Councilor Lundberg said she does not want to throw out the discussions with Lane County. Springfield is a member of Lane County and pays the taxes. The dollar figures per bed are not necessarily that far off no matter who has the jail. The county has to run their jail and the issue is

how to make that work. She is still open to those discussions. If the measure for the Public Safety Facility with a jail does not pass, the city would need to look at what else could be done.

Chief Smith said regarding the cost comparisons that are documented in the agenda packet, the Springfield costs were calculated for seventy percent of capacity for Springfield and one hundred percent capacity elsewhere.

Mr. Kelly said there is also a cost of doing nothing. The fundamental core issue in the community is the citizen's perception of safety. The ECONorthwest report outlines how much the crime rate would continue without this facility over the next twenty years. He discussed taking twenty years to pay off the bond compared to twenty years of not doing anything.

Mayor Leiken asked if there was a temporary facility for the police department if council passes the resolution tonight to put this measure on the ballot, and the city finds the capacity for staffing. He asked where the police would be housed during construction.

Chief Smith said they have talked with consultants to determine whether or not the existing building could be kept intact and in use while the new facility is being built. The jail construction would not be started until the operating costs were secured.

Mr. Kelly said they would design the building so it could stay intact until the jail was ready to be built. They have talked to consultants and that type of design is incorporated in the cost figures presented to council.

Chief Smith said they have not resolved the parking issue yet, but will continue to work on that.

Mayor Leiken said several weeks ago, he spoke with the Lane County Commissioners about this issue. There is more to this than the Lane County Sheriff's office. The current District Attorney spoke before council in support of this jail and recently retired District Attorney, Doug Harclerod, also spoke in support of a municipal jail. He does not know the position of the Lane County Sheriff's Department, but it appears they are not overly supportive of Springfield building a jail. The city does need to work with the county. To find a solution for staffing, the city and county need to work together. This could help with the county and hopefully the Sheriff's Department. Lane County is growing and will need the additional capacity in years to come. He strongly believes the proposed motion for tonight is the right thing to do regarding jail operations. Sometimes it takes a threat to get partners to realize we need to work together. A new police facility and jail has been discussed in Springfield for a number of years and the citizens are supportive.

Councilor Ralston said it is a control issue. Lane County currently has control, but we will soon have control.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:08 pm.

City of Springfield  
Council Special Work Session Minutes  
August 16, 2004  
Page 16

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

---

Sidney W. Leiken  
Mayor

Attest:

---

Amy Sowa  
City Recorder